- 1		
1	ROBIN B. JOHANSEN, State Bar No. 79084 THOMAS A. WILLIS, State Bar No. 160989	
2	REMCHO, JOHANSEN & PURCELL, LLP 201 Dolores Avenue	
3	San Leandro, CA 94577 Phone: (510) 346-6200	
4	FAX: (510) 346-6201	
5	Attorneys for Defendants San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco Board of Education, City and County of San Francisco, Eric Mar, Mark Sanchez, Jane Kim, Kim-Shree Maufas, Norman Yee, Jill Wynns,	
6		
7	Hydra Mendoza, Carlos Garcia, Dan Kelly and S	Sara Lipson
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
11	ANDREA ESQUIVEL, et al.,) No.: CV 07 5709 MHP
12	Plaintiffs,	DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORTOF MOTION TO DISMISS; REQUEST
13	vs.) FOR DECISION ON THE PAPERS
14	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al.,	Hearing:
15	Defendants.	Date: April 21, 2008Time: 2:00 p.m.
16		
17		(The Honorable Marilyn H. Patel)
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
/ 1/7		
27		
27 28	DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION	

DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

TO DISMISS; REQUEST FOR DECISION ON THE PAPERS

- NO. CV 07 5709 MHP

17

Plaintiffs' opposition to defendants' motion to dismiss was due Monday, March 31, 2008, but to date they have filed nothing. Therefore, defendants respectfully request that the Court grant the motion to dismiss based on the papers submitted by them and take the hearing set for April 21, 2008, off calendar.

Although plaintiffs' failure to file an opposition brief may not by itself be grounds for granting the motion, this case has always been one that should be dismissed at the outset. The United States Supreme Court and Ninth Circuit could not be clearer that the First Amendment plays no role in disputes over curriculum decisions made by local school districts. See Rosenberger v. Rector & Visitors of the Univ. of Va., 515 U.S. 819, 833-34 (1995); Downs v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist., 228 F.3d 1003, 1013 (9th Cir. 2000). Plaintiffs have no more of a constitutional right to insist that the San Francisco Board of Education continue offering JROTC than other students have to a course in pacifism or cinematography.

All curriculum decisions are by their nature content-based choices. Each school day has a limited number of hours, and a decision to teach one thing means not being able to teach something else. Offering a course in economics may mean not being able to offer medieval history, and selecting a science book highlighting genetics may mean passing on one that emphasizes global warming.

Even though those decisions are difficult and sometimes even contentious, the courts have made clear that the First Amendment cannot be deployed as a weapon in those battles. The reasons are many and obvious. The First Amendment ensures that governments do not unduly limit the right of others to speak, but it does not limit the government's ability to speak, such as deciding what to teach in public schools. Moreover, to inject the First Amendment in this area would transform federal courts into de facto school boards, saddling those courts with difficult pedagogical and political decisions that are best left to elected officials. Courts would also lack any judicially manageable standards, and schools would be required to offer an unlimited menu of academic choices, with personalized curricula that no school district could begin to afford.

Given the frivolous nature of the underlying claim, plaintiffs' failure to prosecute it efficiently, and the significant attorney's fees defendants have incurred in this case, defendants reserve the right to seek sanctions and/or attorney's fees from plaintiffs.

Case 3:07-cv-05709-MHP Document 24 Filed 04/07/2008 Page 3 of 3

For all these reasons, courts have held that the First Amendment simply does not apply 1 2 to a school district's curriculum choices. Plaintiffs' case therefore must be dismissed. 3 Dated: April 7, 2008 Respectfully submitted, 4 ROBIN B. JOHANSEN THOMAS A. WILLIS 5 REMCHO, JOHANSEN & PURCELL, LLP 6 By: <u>/s/ Thomas A. Willis</u> 7 Thomas A. Willis 8 Attorneys for Defendants San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco Board of Education, 9 City and County of San Francisco, Eric Mar, Mark Sanchez, Jane Kim, Kim-Shree Maufas, Norman 10 Yee, Jill Wynns, Hydra Mendoza, Carlos Garcia, Dan Kelly and Sara Lipson 11 12 (00055222-3) 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28